

## SDC Food Systems Dialogues:

### Notes from English break-out groups, round 2 (18 May 2021)

<b>Fair Prices - Vision:</b> Because society will valorise the role that farmers play in food systems through real costing/pricing, rural populations, especially youth, will have improved economic and social perspectives and farmers will be better included in relevant economic and political decision making processes.....	3
<b>Social Movements and Networks – Vision:</b> Strong social movements and networks between households, at national and community levels promote not only healthier nutrition and sustainable food systems, but facilitate better economic cooperation along the value and supply chains and in family/care work and thus allow equal opportunities for men and women in economic activities as well as equal political participation.....	7
<b>Sustainable Production - Vision:</b> Because production will be more sustainable and supply chains shorter, producers and consumers will be more closely linked, food and food choices will be healthier and prices be fairer and livelihoods more decent, while food loss and waste, the use of natural resources and impacts to the environment and emissions will be minimized.....	10
<b>Conducive policies - Vision:</b> National agriculture and food policies support sustainably produced regional and seasonal food and information on healthy and sustainable diets, thereby promoting agro-ecological management of resources and the access to and affordability of safe and nutritious food for the whole society.....	13
<b>Nutrition Awareness - Vision:</b> The systematic integration of nutrition in school curricula, maternal and infant care, etc. contributes to people’s preference for a healthy diet and the production of diverse and sustainable foods, leading to improved availability and accessibility of healthy and sustainable food for all.....	14
<b>Healthy School Meals - Vision:</b> The promotion of agro-ecologically sourced meals in school & community kitchens will ensure a constant demand for agro-ecologically produced foods and healthy diets for all pupils/people of society and improve performance of students in school and people in their work.....	17
<b>Access to Land - Vision:</b> Land and judicial reforms allow the improved and equitable access to land and justice for all, explicitly also for women and youth, thus securing all farmers’ investments made on the land and the sustainable and resilient development of decent livelihoods and economic independence.....	18
<b>Fair Trade Policies - Vision:</b> Appropriate import, export and tax regimes in countries will allow farmers to focus on products that are competitive on national, regional and international markets, allowing the creation of income and job opportunities along rural-urban supply and value chains.....	21
<b>Reliable Data and Certification - Vision:</b> A national system on accurate, safe and reliable data and certification in production, distribution, processing, marketing and consumption of agricultural products will inform on the necessary elements of appropriate legal frameworks and appropriate resource use for agricultural value-chains.....	24

<b>Conducive Research Partnerships - Vision:</b> International agricultural research partnerships focus on the elements of agroecology and climate resilience and take into account different regional contexts, especially also low income and/or fragile countries, and make their findings available to all. ....	26
<b>Agroecological Farming - Vision:</b> An agroecological diversification of production and low-impact farming practices reducing the use of fossil fuels and chemical inputs lead to more sustainable management of natural resources, safer food consumption and the creation of more employment opportunities. ....	28
<b>Intact Natural Resources - Vision:</b> Intact natural resources: By switching to locally adapted crops, soil conservation methods and sustainable irrigation systems, which use as little water as possible, (cost-) efficient food production can be maintained, while preserving water resources & aquaculture, improving soil quality, reducing soil-erosion and better adapting to adverse effects of climate change. ....	31

## Notes Discussion Group: Fair Prices

**Fair Prices - Vision:** Because society will valorise the role that farmers play in food systems through real costing/pricing, rural populations, especially youth, will have improved economic and social perspectives and farmers will be better included in relevant economic and political decision making processes.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

*Proposed action 1: create inclusive dialogue platforms gathering all stakeholders in the food value chain, to discuss costing/pricing and how to better value contributions and services of farmers to society*

The platforms will allow to:

- Promote transparency (especially for the activities of large private operators) and information sharing, allowing to overcome information asymmetries
- Provide farmers with price information (smallholders often have limited access to price information)
- Provide farmers with information on safety and quality requirements of products
- Provide consumers with information about safety, quality (including nutritional values) and environmental/social benefits of food production
- Allow all stakeholders understand their respective challenges

Overall, the platforms will result in increased negotiation power for farmers, and greater trust among all stakeholders. The platforms are meant to give farmers a voice.

A neutral convener should be tasked with setting up and leading those platforms. Local governments or governors would be good candidates. Farmers' organisations should also play a leading role in managing the platforms.

*Proposed action 2: use the power of media (broadcasting, shows, theatre, tv, social media etc.) to implement large-scale awareness campaigns on the value of food production and its role in environmental sustainability, targeting both producers and consumers*

The campaigns will lead to greater awareness of the realities of farming and of farmers' contributions to society. They will result in greater dynamism of local food economies, and establish a favorable context for improved market structures and better prices for farmers.

The campaigns should be based on broad consultations with all food stakeholders, but the leading/implementing role would presumably fall on local governments/governors.

*Proposed action 3: reform national, regional and global trade policies to make food trade more inclusive and incentivize sustainable food production in developing countries*

Without appropriate trade policies, farmers cannot sell their produce at fair prices, which prevents them from improving their economic and social perspectives.

Trade policy reforms will result in:

- Smallholders in developing countries facing less barriers to trade, and developing countries playing a bigger role in global food trade
- Local produce in developing countries being competitive versus international food imports (e.g. the case of rice, which is of central importance in several countries)

Trade policy reforms should be carried out at various levels, but a leading role should be played by the WTO.

*Proposed action 4: support farmers in improving their productivity by increasing access to key inputs and services*

Although the main driver of productivity increases is private investment done by farmers themselves, putting an enabling environment in place is essential. This involves improving access to water, electricity, infrastructure and innovative technology.

There should be a better understanding of family businesses' needs too, and especially of young people's needs. Financial inclusion will be crucial, as well as capacity building. Contract farming may support farmers to deliver better quality food.

Increased productivity of farmers will result in farmers being in a better position to master costs and adjust to prices, allowing for better farmer remunerations and livelihoods perspectives.

Productivity enhancement initiatives require leadership from government authorities in partnership with farmers' organizations, the private sector (input suppliers, water and electricity providers, tech companies) and other relevant stakeholders.

2.2 How can different kinds of organization (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

Farmers can contribute to the vision by playing an active role in setting up dialogue platforms, informing awareness campaigns, contesting unfavorable trade regimes, improving their productivity and business, and making their voices heard more generally.

- Top food producers do already have a strong lobby and may not be interested in information sharing (participating in dialogue platforms). On the other hand, we see, more and more, private sector getting engaged in multi-stakeholder platforms - a development that could be better used for our vision.

Currently, in donor/SDC supported programs the implementer takes the lead in establishing dialogue platform(s) while interested/involved private sector acts as convener. But it has been observed that alliances or associations could play that convening role too.

Ultimately, there is no one-size-fit-all solution when it comes to identifying leading organizations for setting up dialogue platforms on costing/pricing issues. There are no goes in certain contexts e.g. related to political sensitive issues (such as to support farmers' organization because of other issues) hence there is always need for local and national solutions.

Overall, the leading role for setting up dialogue platforms on costing/pricing issues should fall on a neutral actor. Local governments or governors are hence natural candidates for such a role. The same observation holds for awareness campaigns.

On the question of trade regimes, international institutions and the WTO in particular will play a crucial role in facilitating reforms. Environmental sustainability is at the center of WTO's work (measurements in place). The WTO should continue to work to create incentives for more sustainable forms of farming and increase inclusion of smallholders in global food trade networks.

### 2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

#### **Recommendation 1:**

- What: prices faced by farmers adjust to reach a fair level and truly reflect the value farmers bring to society and the environment. Farmers' remuneration improve. There is equal participation and integration of all stakeholders in decision-making on food markets
- Who: local governments/governors, farmers' organisations
- How: dialogue between food systems stakeholders through the setup of inclusive platforms, allowing for open, transparent and evidence-based discussion and negotiation on food costing/pricing, and valorisation of food production as an activity. The platforms support the build-up of effective networks, make everyone informed and understand the 'fair business' (all the stakeholder will have the leverage with everyone and gives all voices heard; cooperation, information sharing, ....). Ultimately, the platform lead to fair prices, a level playing field on food markets and a well-functioning food system. Food system stakeholders trust each other and farmers have their voices heard.

#### **Recommendation 2:**

- What: radical change in valorisation of food is triggered throughout society; production and services delivered by farmers are valued beyond production costs; consumers are more aware of all the services provided by the farmers beyond production of food (e.g. ecosystem services)
- Who: local governments, Min of Ag, Min of Finances etc across ministries, farmers and consumer associations
- How: Awareness campaigns targeting both producers and consumers on issues of fair trade and the value generated by farming to society.

#### **Recommendation 3:**

- What: national, regional and global trade regimes shift to become more favourable to smallholders in developing countries and incentivise sustainable production methods
- Who: WTO, international institutions, governments, international farmers' organisations

- **How:** global communication, lobby and political advocacy in favour of fair trade and a more equitable food system. The new trade rules acknowledge current imbalances in global food trade and seek to support the competitiveness of smallholders in developing countries and the environmental sustainability of food production.

**Recommendation 4:**

- **What:** farmers' productivity and profitability increase, allowing to boost investment as well as quality and safety of food, improving market conditions, farmers' livelihoods and involvement in decision-making processes
- **Who:** government authorities in partnership with farmers' organizations, the private sector (input suppliers, water and electricity providers, tech companies) and other relevant stakeholders
- **How:** higher levels of productivity and profitability for farmers will be achieved by establishing an enabling environment (water, electricity, infrastructure including innovative technology), expanding contract farming, supporting trade fairs and marketing to advertise local foods, leveraging the potential of new tech to communicate on innovative farming techniques, and capacity building for youth wanting to start agribusinesses.

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

**The pros and cons of subsidies need to be understood better - 'smart subsidies' may contribute to fair prices:**

- E.g. as incentives over a transition period towards sustainability;
- Subsidies for what: Topping up - subsidies to farmers by paying for e.g. ecosystem services (agroecology) to the communities and make sure that they are not market distortive
- Make sure that consumers and the whole society understands the approach behind subsidies for farming systems and fair prices (awareness building).
- Subsidies and affordability of the products by consumers goes hand in hand.

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

Effectiveness of campaigns – does it have impact on fair prices, did it improve in other countries, eg. example Rwanda (we need more evidence)

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

Not discussed

## Notes Discussion Group: Social Movements and Networks

**Social Movements and Networks – Vision:** Strong social movements and networks between households, at national and community levels promote not only healthier nutrition and sustainable food systems, but facilitate better economic cooperation along the value and supply chains and in family/care work and thus allow equal opportunities for men and women in economic activities as well as equal political participation.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

Summary of issues from Round 1 that were discussed in depth: see below

2.2 How can different kinds of organization (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

These are summarized in each item

2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

These are summarized when addressing the “how” questions in each item below

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

The question of trust in technologies still needs attention especially with new technologies such as block chain techs and the focus on top down solutions that are more common

There appear to be low trust in certification, technology can be explored to help bridge the gap in prices between the consumers and producers

There is need to consider power imbalances in the networks and value chains that we need to pay attention to

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

- It is not clear yet how much the industry willing to change and who should initiate the change
- Who should hold social movements to exert some pressure on the industry, who is to hold them accountable beyond labeling?
- What is the role of policy in accountability, especially in long and complex value chains?
- When talking about short value chains and the gap between consumers and producers, there is a trade-off between health value for consumers and returns for producers. How do we handle the trade-offs between health food and costs?

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

None

### Summary of issues from Round 1 that were discussed in depth:

1. Technology use and Accessibility: Appropriate technologies and associated costs as well as technology use and how open it is

2. Networks and their role in learning and how best to support social networks for extension work
3. The gap between consumers and farmers and value added chains: what is better for smallholder farmers?
4. Counterbalancing pandemic effects on trade
5. Role of context in the social networks dynamics

### **1) Technology use and Accessibility: Appropriate technologies and associated costs as well as technology use and how open it is**

*What:* There is need to promote participatory approaches in design of technologies and to enhance access and openness

*Target:* Farmers cooperatives, governments, NGOs, UN, civil societies, private sector by use of tools and platforms, empower for economic benefits – cooperative empowerment software; tool boxes; tailor for consumer groups and cooperatives; integrated communication using integrated technologies; e.g. for market access.

*How:* By incorporating farmers in the design of technologies and promoting use of available tools boxes (set of technologies and innovations) and platforms that integrate communications and empower the target groups to benefit economically.

*Success:* Availability of decentralized and localized technology tool kits of best practices for wider use, adaptation

Creating partnerships with the governments; linking in with the private sector, but ensure accountability and measuring success; including academia and research to increase their outreach

### **2) Networks and their role in learning and how best to support social networks for extension**

*What:* Integrate social networks as an extension tool

*Target:* UN, NGOs, civil societies, producer cooperatives, private sector, and governments

*How:* Make use of available tools such as social media guidelines; working through seed groups, incorporating the private sector, making use of platforms for messaging to extensions while embedding in other elements; and use of digital technology to close knowledge gaps. Some examples have been cited in Ghana and Nigeria on deployment of technology to close knowledge gaps

*Success:* Measuring success and accountability will be through improvement in farmer welfare in terms of decent living standards for farmers; access to knowledge and information on prices and markets for actors for relevant decisions, ensure farmers with a better voice especially where governments control prices, involvement of farmers in setting prices and policy contributions, generate success stories and have some references for this success.

KPI would include click numbers (altmetrics), downloads, sharing numbers in social media and other parameters; how much more involvement by youth in agriculture, patterns of change among youth, women, and entrepreneurships.

Accountability- this would mainly be via paying fair prices by industry and commitment to the same



### **3) The gap between consumers and farmers and value added chains: what is better for smallholder farmers?**

What: urbanization is contributing to increasing gap between consumers and producers. Consumers are getting further and further away from farmers.

Target: Government policy, industry leaders/retail and merchandising, UN, Farmer organizations, consumers, civil societies

How: influence structural changes and patterns of consuming food products to effect changes, for example through direct trade, direct communications between the producers and consumers; segmenting the markets. Create awareness about the food products that we consume, policy issues such as in fishery and fishing need to be implemented and ensure changes in international trade and regulations. There is need to enhance trust in the value chains and take a whole value chain approach, promoting value networks rather than individual actors. Grassroots solutions through communities, consumers, economic integration, and software for cooperatives to address some of these gaps are important. Movements to increase pressure to transform all levels of the food systems is required, farmers empowered to link to consumers, Consumers empowered to link to producers, movement to incorporate children as well and other human areas.

Accountability: We should look at willingness of the industry to change, to adapt to practices to link with producers, build social movements to exert pressure on industry, increase accountability by the governments

Measuring success: Ensure there are mechanisms to support the more vulnerable in the communities so that they do not get worse; number of movements; sensitization programs; available digital services to support farmers and youth and attract them in the value chains. Palm oil industry is an example of positive steps towards this consumer-producer changes. Another example is the chocolate industry where smaller firms establish partnerships with local producers; can pattern be replicated in big industry?

### **4) Counterbalancing pandemic effects on trade**

Differential effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on men, women, children, across countries signifies importance of local food production, there are lessons to strengthen networks.

There is an opportunity for the food industry, the question is how to use it to achieve more partnerships from raised awareness. Results have been mixed, in some areas, there were shortages, others not.

The effects of the pandemic have been documented for traders, processors, consumers, producers, governments, NGOs and other actors.

The question is how the pandemic can foster local production and consumption.

Lack of will, resolve to resolve food and nutrition issues, water, sanitation

### **Context issues cut across the above key issues**

## Notes Discussion Group: Sustainable Production

**Sustainable Production - Vision:** Because production will be more sustainable and supply chains shorter, producers and consumers will be more closely linked, food and food choices will be healthier and prices be fairer and livelihoods more decent, while food loss and waste, the use of natural resources and impacts to the environment and emissions will be minimized.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.7 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

Infrastructure - rural roads so smallholder farmers have access to markets.

Investment/PPP - increased number of initiatives and increased finance and investments into this.

Digital - in ten years all smallholder farmers need to be on the grid and access need to be free for especially for vulnerable groups. Crucial to development viable business models for digital service provision to farmers. Not likely to become a public good.

Climate smart - Established a functioning market in terms of services and supply. Agricultural production will only become climate smart if it adds values to the involved stakeholder.

Farmers organization - the majority of smallholder farmers needs to organize themselves in producer cooperatives or other similar systems (youth and women in particular). Service provision to individual smallholders can never become financially viable.

Policy environment - law needs to follow intentions and enforcement ability needs to be in place. (example of problematic law: In Switzerland 80 % of subsidies is on livestock - need to change the perspective)

Big Corporate - higher degree of global responsibility. This can be influenced by shareholders, investors and customers.

Rich consumers - start to demand sustainable products to drive the change.

Access to finance - include the bottom billion, reduce bureaucracy and ease access especially for women and youth.

Use of natural resources - balancing the demand and utilization of water - smart water system (IoT). Prerequisite better soil data. Quote Mahatma Gandhi: "The world has enough for everyone's need, but not enough for everyone's greed." Note: The world population is 3 times bigger now and consumption of natural resources has exploded.

Trade facilitation - more efficient trade increase efficiency and reduce losses, including post-harvest losses.

2.8 How can different kinds of organisation (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

Infrastructure - role of government crucial here plus the international financial institutions for loans. China continues to be the main player on this market with strategic interest, few environmental concerns and nontransparent contracts.

Investment/PPP - co creation and co implementation at different levels.

Digital - private sector, venture capital needed. Government on legislation.

Climate Smart - private sector driven needs to be part of corporate principle. Government on legislation.

Farmers organization - need to be formed bottom up by farmers themselves but not by government - the less government interference the better on this. Support and interest from relevant private sector partners. Risk that Farmers organization get politicized.

Policy environment - government and general public

Big Corporate - Shareholders use their voting rights to change the policy of big cooperate.

Access to finance - Financial service providers support by governments

Use of natural resources - private sector. Government on legislation and its enforcement. An area prone to corruption.

Trade facilitation - government on rules and regulations, private sector of rolling out efficient digital supported logistic systems.

## 2.9 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

Five recommendations:

1. Enabling environment: Look at it in a system perspective, power structure (land rights) farmers empowerment (farmers organization) and economics (political systems access to capital). The agronomic challenges are not the most pertinent ones but the structural, political, and economic challenges.
2. Promoting digital solution across the board: Requires venture capital and must be private sector driven. So far digitalization in smallholder farming has been donor driven and failed to scale.
3. Pull factor on demand: Awareness and transparency systems shareholders and consumers. Markets, producers, and value chains responds to demand. Consumer behavior is one of the strongest instruments for change.
4. Markets and investments. The wish for shorter supply chains needs global marked regulations as the current free trade systems favors big corporate. It requires demand for local products and investment in local market infrastructure to meet the demand.
5. Natural resource management - water soil key elements to sustain biodiversity and lower climate impact. Poverty remains a major obstacle to proper NRM.

## 2.10 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

Though consumer awareness and behavioral change is an immensely powerful tool, transparency is missing. Traceability of food are missing - consumers do not see the big picture. Little awareness of the climate, environment, biodiversity, poverty impact of consumption. Not only food consumption but all consumption. Cheap products, often mean produced with no concern for workers health, environment, climate and so forth.

2.11 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

Trade facilitation action needs to be more inclusive and more efficient. Lots of food lost on transborder transportation of food - too bureaucratic. Reducing food waste is one of the cheapest ways of increasing food availability. It is already produced so no additional carbon footprint or drain in natural resources. Why is there not more focus on this?

2.12 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

There was a general consensus that all the positive things in the Sustainable Production statement are counter logic to the current global paradigm and of economic growth and its related structures. It seems also difficult to argue that the bottom billion, of which many are farming families, should change behavior to safe the planet, when the top 10 % creates almost 90 % of the problems.

## Notes Discussion Group: Conducive policies

**Conducive policies - Vision:** National agriculture and food policies support sustainably produced regional and seasonal food and information on healthy and sustainable diets, thereby promoting agro-ecological management of resources and the access to and affordability of safe and nutritious food for the whole society.

Round 2 Objective: In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.13 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

- Need to involve young policy makers without gender discrimination.
- Review of existing policy on regular basis.
- Monitor and review policies
- Sign bilateral agreements and involvement of all stakeholders.

2.14 How can different kinds of organisation (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

- Awareness raising about healthy living through food policies.
- Print, electronic and digital media need to be involved for education and opinion building.

2.15 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

- Beyond national agriculture and food policies, develop regional agriculture and food policies that go beyond trade and political interests and include environment, social and cultural aspects.
- Ensure that national agriculture and food policies are implemented and effective, considering regional policies (if there are any).
- Good policies which include a series of measures/elements, starting with education and awareness raising, triggering behavioral change at consumer level leading to healthy and sustainable diets.

2.16 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

- Focus on trade not healthy and sustainable diets.
- Trans-boundary agreements.

2.17 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

-Behavior and social change.

2.18 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

## Notes Discussion Group: Nutrition Awareness

**Nutrition Awareness - Vision:** The systematic integration of nutrition in school curricula, maternal and infant care, etc. contributes to people's preference for a healthy diet and the production of diverse and sustainable foods, leading to improved availability and accessibility of healthy and sustainable food for all.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue (**a few weeks later**), the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions. The group work in this round will follow a plenary presentation to update participants on the results of Round 1. You will also be provided in advance with summary results based on the notes you shared with us from Round 1.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

Awareness raising is not effective/relevant, unless it is part of a **systemic change** (e.g. government programs to incentivize and help farmers to shift production towards healthier foods).

### Possible awareness raising communication actions:

- Using songs and local champions to reach out to a broader public, deliver clear and simple message, incl. younger people
- Reach farmers via radio and other forms of broadcasting, newspapers/magazines specifically written for farmers
- Public viewings
- Field schools that are organized directly by farmers and/or with advisory services provided by the government – this would involve both actors in actively raising awareness (e.g. of field schools in China regarding input use)

How to **move from awareness raising to behaviour change**: Focus on **family-scale** (where decision-making on consumption takes place)

- Target younger generations – potential to influence parents
- Specific training for rural women regarding nutrition

Necessary to **better define “health diets / nutrition / foods”**:

- Is it just nutritious food? (where nutritious = foods that guarantee the necessary vitamin, mineral and other nutrient intake)
- Is it the same as “eco-friendly” or sustainably produced foods?
- Role of water in healthy diets: fruits & veggies that are washed with contaminated water, safe drinking water to avoid turning to alternative sugary drinks to hydrate
- Role of food preparation – processed foods, raw food, cooked, deep-freezing // role of traditional practices, culture
- Role of food production, e.g. soil quality. What is the trade-off between sustainable production and nutritious if sustainably produced and healthy foods are used interchangeably?

**Key stakeholders** and respective role:

- Government: programs and policies + partnerships with private sector to stimulate both supply and demand sides (e.g. vitamin and mineral fortified rice)
- Consumer: shifting preferences and change in consumption patterns to create demand for healthy foods

- Private sector: taking into account nutrition aspects in purchasing from farmers and supplying consumers
- NGOs: give a voice to local people, push to include consumer and local producers' concerns in the political agenda

Role of government includes:

- Making sure that prices are appropriately set to ensure affordability of healthy diets
- Integrating/Coordinating demand and supply sides of the value chain
- Subsidies (e.g. school meals), stop subsidies for unhealthy foods (if it is the case)
- Legislating / promoting packaging/labelling standards to inform consumers on the nutritional value of their consumption (e.g. Nutri-score in Europe, NB: on-going research on how to apply labels in LMICs to reduce consumption of salt, unhealthy fats and sugar)

2.2 How can different kinds of organisation (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

**Local NGOs** – Because they work closely with local communities, they have an important role in **community outreach, data collection** that can be used to generate **policy recommendations and coordinate** with the government

**NGOs in developed countries** – they play a role in **awareness raising campaigns, critical thinking** around nutrition. However, the government's role is necessary to coordinate / harmonize message and actions, especially in the case of a **fragmented NGO landscape** (due to presence of multiple and uncoordinated actors)

2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

1. Nutrition awareness is important, but often neglected. However, raising awareness on healthy nutrition **should not only focus on school and maternal-infant care, it should target the entire value chain and take into account the specific context** in which we want to work.
2. Raising awareness requires **coordinated and strategic communication campaigns** that use multiple channels and formats. Specific campaigns should target different groups and be adapted accordingly.
3. **Multiple actors** need to be involved in raising awareness (and subsequently in pushing for behaviour change):
  - Government – school programs and other programs to target specific groups, bridging demand and supply
  - Social / civil-society organisations: NGOs, farmer networks (knowledge diffusion)
  - Private sector: also has an important – logistics, pivot between consumer and producers
4. Healthy nutrition should be **better integrated into the political discourse and programs at various scales** (local, national and international) and should also be integrated into other programs (e.g. food security). However this **will require better defining “healthy nutrition / diets / foods”** and include water aspects (e.g. safe drinking water) (more details in “Action” section of summary). Better integrating “nutrition” in political discourses also implies better **coordination between food-related policy messages** (e.g. in terms of food production, food security, markets).

#### 2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

Discussions related to the vision statements (NB: these were briefly discussed, but no decision was made within the group):

- Replace healthy with nutritious?
- Replace “systematic integration” with “mainstreaming”?
- Go beyond only schools and maternal-infant care programmes and include nutrition awareness in training programmes for farmers
- Other actors in the value chain should be explicitly included
- Explicitly mention the in-/directly influencing consumer preference is meant to incentivize the production and supply of healthier / more nutritious foods
- Better define what “healthy means”

How can they be managed: n/a

#### 2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

Despite training / awareness raising campaigns, how to convince farmers to switch from cash-crops to more diverse and nutritious foods? (i.e. additional/complementary incentives to guarantee shift in production)

#### 2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

Smaller discussion group vs. 1<sup>st</sup> round. Asymmetrical representation of stakeholders: only women and only NGO (2/3 from central Europe) and SDC representatives.



## Notes Discussion Group: Healthy School Meals

**Healthy School Meals - Vision:** The promotion of agro-ecologically sourced meals in school & community kitchens will ensure a constant demand for agro-ecologically produced foods and healthy diets for all pupils/people of society and improve performance of students in school and people in their work.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

A wide range of stakeholders must be included. Action must be taken to secure commitment from schools through for example procurement requirements. The critical stakeholders need to be brought together: Ministry of Agriculture (and Livestock), Ministry of Education, and Ministry of Health. More clarity on budget and mandates is essential. Achieving this needs people that understand all three areas and that are able to convene and facilitate policy dialogue between them. At the local level, committees and community-based organisations need to be supported. Other actions that are required is to ensure schools have adequate food production units (land, vegetable beds, access to water) and complementary infrastructure specifically storage and canteen facilities and the administrative capacity to manage the entire process from procurement to serving food on premises.

2.2 How can different kinds of organisation (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

N/A – Question was not specifically addressed but some aspects covered in Session 1 (see notes above).

2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

Training on mass cooking, reducing waste, and proper storage. Recipe books for school chefs, opening up school canteens to local communities. E.g., in the evening as income generating opportunities, using nearby food kiosks to assist and complement school meals. On procurement, need different example of procurement regulations and better understanding of how these work (pros & cons). E.g., how to incorporate criteria that go beyond price, and how to weight different criteria.

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

Use of the term agro-ecologically produced – does not guarantee healthy food. Manage by emphasizing safety and diversity, and also recognizing that due to seasonality and locality, some food will necessarily be imported or not local. Have realistic transition periods, take a setp-wise approach and start with pilot projects from which to learn.

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

How to address needs of schools in urban areas, and how would these ideas / recommendations differ in urban contexts? Should there be more emphasis on demand creation and student moevements. E.g., Green Fridays in Italy, Pocket Money pledge in Bangladesh.

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

Unfortunately not all of the participants from Round 1 took part so the discussion was somewhat limited. Many issues we discussed have been nicely documented in two WFP reports on school feeding programs in 46 countries, along with some insightful case studies. [https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp263529.pdf?\\_ga=2.154921016.1483539147.1621516965-1019978411.1621323375](https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp263529.pdf?_ga=2.154921016.1483539147.1621516965-1019978411.1621323375) and <https://www.wfp.org/publications/home-grown-school-feeding-resource-framework>

## Notes Discussion Group: Access to Land

**Access to Land - Vision:** Land and judicial reforms allow the improved and equitable access to land and justice for all, explicitly also for women and youth, thus securing all farmers' investments made on the land and the sustainable and resilient development of decent livelihoods and economic independence.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

- Land and landscapes approaches, acknowledge the multifunctionality of landscapes and multiple claims, then we can negotiate how to design and plan these land systems.
- Cross reference to two important and related UN declarations; ie. the recent UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants (UNDROP) and the UN declaration on family farming + Voluntary Guidelines on Land Tenure → but they must be respected and taken into account.
- When we talk of access to land we need to look at international food systems, we see huge commercial ambition to have everybody eat the same food. How can we help smallholder farmers be part of this negotiation and ensure they keep their land in the face of multinational enterprises?
- Civil society claiming the right of family farmers – how to ensure they have impact when raising their claim?
- Legitimacy vs legality, usually what's legal is combined by the power dynamics in a specific context. Legal situation can be changed over land ownership.
- Push to change national policies to ease access to land. Protection for the “weak” farmers in the face of private sector interests and government implications needed to protect smallholder farmers.
- Regaining access to land, think also about the opportunities for expansion too, allow for development opportunities. This must be made clear in the vision. This is not a static systems – allow for exits, expansion, etc.
- Big companies: Multi-functionality of land, ecosystem services must be included in contracts with farmers and multinational enterprises. Abide certain rules and respect multifunctionality and ecosystem functions
- Tools and mechanisms needed to protect local communities, declarations aren't enough, voluntary guidelines neither. Commitments to ensure they are implemented – checks and balances for accountability.
- The most important is to find ways to hold government and private sector accountable to protect farmers' control on the land they have.
- Agrarian reform : issue of collective ownership of land, agro-ecology of farms, policies to be in place.
- Guidelines are there but need commitments to make them work on the ground

- Acknowledge the multi-functionality of landscapes: Multiple actors, multiple levels, and multiple claims – need to make them fit better; The simple fact of acknowledging the multiple actors keeps them in the picture in decision making. Next step then make sure there is an inclusive way of designing and planning the landscape. Different stakeholders have to acknowledge the multitude of other actors, government is only one of them.
- Create spaces where multiple claims can be discussed and agreed.
- Contextualize the solutions according to a number of guiding principles about land use and access to land. The main guiding principle should be “justice in nature – people relation”.
- Displacement of local people because of nature conservation/protected areas is not a just relation rather it is a problematic one. Landscape / nature conservation should also consider the local people that are part of the landscape. Eg. biofuel production motivation for displacing local people is not sustainable development. Eg2. displacement of local farmers for big soya producers in Latin America for intensive meat production.
- Small holder producers and their culture in the center of the global food system. One message is that food system can't be structured outside local communities/smallholder producers; they are central to the global food systems. it is about choices (i.e. cultural choices), ecological balance/biodiversity and livelihood. It is not about monetary profit as the case is for multinationals! That is why a concept of food sovereignty fits well
- Consumer aspect – what expectations consumers have on where food is produced and the implications it may have.
- Remark on Consumer awareness, still needs to have some boundaries, right approaches for changing consumer behavior.. Eg. Not all small farmers are ready to take new marketing approaches due to the additional burden on them - such as the need for certification of products in online sales

## 2.2 How can different kinds of organisation (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

- International NGOs can support raising voice of smallholder farmers at higher levels
- Government must be implicated and hold accountable for the protection of smallholder farmers facing private sector's pressure.
- International organization have to make sure that the ones who have different negotiation power have to be present so that they defend their needs rather than others (NGOs or else) speaking for them – empower .
- Multinational companies
- Local communities
- National governments are key players and much of the power is in them. (they have to ensure welfare of the people + they have the power to adopt regulations) But they are also confronted by different claims from different sides
- Unified will among governments to make sure that smallholder producers are in the center of the global food system, if not the whole Summit will be a talk-shop only.

- Transparency at international level of big companies – about allocation of land rights, sales, payments for concessions, etc. the information should be declared and available internationally.

2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

- Relevant international frameworks and guidelines with regard to access to land need to be respected. In particular the recent UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants (UNDROP), the UN declaration on family farming, the CFS Voluntary Guidelines on Land Tenure (VGGT) and the PRAI.
- National governments have a key role to play in guaranteeing these rights. Strong commitment to these guidelines by national governments, private investors, and global donors is essential.
- Transparency related to large scale land investment (domestic and international) is essential: contracts should be made open (allocation of land rights, sales, payments for concessions, environmental impact assessments, M&E report) be made available by investors and concerned governments (host and target countries).
- The access and equitable access to land is important, however this needs to be guaranteed in a flexible system that also allows investment and growth of smallholder farms, in order not to constrain emerging family farmers who want to expand their business.
- The multi-functionality nature of land, and competing claims over this land must be fully acknowledged and understood. Spaces must be created where these competing claims can be negotiated and also weaker stakeholders have a voice.
- Where large commercial agriculture is expanding, rules and regulations must ensure that multi-functionality of land and the related ecosystem services are maintained and nature is protected.

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

## Notes Discussion Group: Fair Trade Policies

**Fair Trade Policies - Vision:** Appropriate import, export and tax regimes in countries will allow farmers to focus on products that are competitive on national, regional and international markets, allowing the creation of income and job opportunities along rural-urban supply and value chains.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

The summit will be a success if it **can change the current discourse: Trade** should not be seen any more **as a barrier** but instead it should be **amplified** as an **important tool** to promote a **transformation in food systems!** Because it is an **engine of growth** and we have to make sure to include a lot of people in it. If this is done, the discussion can then be guided to all the topics trade touches (international, regional, local, transit, import, export, tax etc.)

**Visions statement: Appropriate import, export and tax regimes in countries will allow farmers to focus on products that are competitive on national, regional and international markets, allowing the creation of income and job opportunities along rural-urban supply and value chains.**

### Actions that need to be taken:

1. **Value chains:** We have to develop the rural areas and decentralize the rural system in order to address **urban migration**, by providing especially the youth and women (**gender mainstreaming**) with **meaningful jobs** and a **fair income**. The producers should be really **well organised** to contribute to the rural development and be competitive in the food systems that affect them.
2. The role of **policies:** we all know that governments come up and decide with their policies --> solution to this is **the public-private partnership:** so we have to include the civil society and the private sector which will **widen policy-engagement** on particular inefficiencies, this will make food systems more inclusive and relevant! The role of policy-engagement is about mobilizing the **marginalized voices (especially farmers)** so all operate on the same level!
3. To include more the **marginalized sections** of society we should create an **interface** between **formal and informal economies** (as it has been shown in Africa and South-Asia). To **formalize trade** (f.e. family organizations), there should be **incentives** for the private sector and also an **agreeable agenda**, where it is clear what we want to achieve, what is needed to be done and who it does represent.
4. Our **approach** should be **bottom-up:** going back to fair-trade (**safe working conditions, protecting the environment and transparency**) and moving from informal to formal trade in order to capture all relevant **information in statistics**. Because planning is much easier when we have **numbers and facts!** We can do this by **organizing** and reaching out not to individuals, which is difficult, but instead more to **groups and networks** of people.
5. To achieve this, all actors need to be committed, not only the **producers but also the consumers!** If we want to ensure fair trade, we need **standards** and

**transparency** that are applied through all areas because at the moment, an effective **monitoring and reporting mechanism** for this need is missing! So we need to have a clear baseline and develop **clear indicators for the tracking progress**. We need to check, if the **WTO** should be mandated to pick this up as a key task.

6. Furthermore and very important, we need to **reduce tax** and move unnecessary trade procedures and cost from products! This applies for **producing** as well as **consuming** those products, for which we have to allow **lower tariff and less charges** to make better and **fairer prices!** To achieve this, actors like **custom unions and governments** should find **actionable solutions** and **measures**. Trade should be used to promote sustainable development!

7. Facilitating **cross-border-trade** needs to be monitored in order that implementation of **fair trade** is ensured. One solution to simplify cross-border-trade-facilitation would be **borderless alliances** and the **responsible stakeholder** for this change is the **World Custom Union**. It needs to be a deal between countries (private trading partners) where a **certification scheme** and uniform **set of rules** should be used depending on the product (cacao, palmoil etc.)

8. An example for this is Switzerland's palmoil-pact with Indonesia, which fosters **sustainable products** and also helps the local **supply-chain!** To ensure that fair trade products are really better off, we have to look for exactly such **mechanisms**. Another one would be to lower border taxes for products that are **reducing CO2-emissions**. Here we have to pay attention to **non-tariff barriers** as well which are more challenging cause they are harder to detect.

2.2 How can different kinds of organizations (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

**Food Security** has a new **agency** which means: you determine what and how you produce. Organizations like SDC should promote this much more!

2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

Propose **actionable solutions** that are easy to understand because the summit will be a **people's summit** and so it needs to be **as simple as possible!**

1. Address **urban migration** by developing rural areas and providing the youth and women (**gender mainstreaming**) with **meaningful jobs** and **income**.
2. Build a **public-private-partnership** (governments, civil society and private sector) to foster **policy-engagement** and mobilize the **marginalized voices**
3. Present an **agreeable agenda** and **incentives** for the private sector to create an **interface** between informal and formal economies (**formalize trade**)
4. Use a **bottom-up-approach** by reaching out to **groups and networks** of people to get all relevant information in statistics (**implementing fair-trade**)
5. For a fair-trade apply **standards and transparency** with an effective **monitoring mechanism** to which all actors commit (**producers & consumers**)
6. **Reduce tax**, allow **lower tariff** and **less charges** on products for producers and consumers to make **fairer prices** (custom unions and governments)
7. **Simplify** cross-border-trade-facilitation by **borderless alliances** with a **certification scheme** and an uniform **set of rules** on products (cacao, palmoil)
8. Lower border taxes for **sustainable products** (f.e. reducing CO2-emissions) to make fair-trade more **worthwhile** and to help the **local supply-chain**

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

Trade, Tax regimes, Public-Private-Partnerships, Capacity-Building, Gender mainstreaming, Youth --> try to include as **many stakeholders** as possible!

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

- Which stakeholders should **be addressed**? Who would **take responsibility** and **the lead** to realize the **implementation** of all these proposed actions?
- Are **Fair trade certificates** still useful?

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

...

## Notes Discussion Group: Reliable Data and Certification

**Reliable Data and Certification - Vision:** A national system on accurate, safe and reliable data and certification in production, distribution, processing, marketing and consumption of agricultural products will inform on the necessary elements of appropriate legal frameworks and appropriate resource use for agricultural value-chains.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

#	Actor	Task
	Nat. Govt. (executive)	<b>Multi-stakeholder dialogue (process):</b> Bringing together the 100 most relevant actors in data/certification space within a country Base for digital strategy and data platform > Which data is needed immediately (weather), which is still valid after a year or ten.
	Trustworthy partner within country, Ministry of Agriculture	<b>Data and stakeholder landscape analysis (Dialogue)</b> (who is capable to provide/collect data by what means/tools, who is interested in using data, is there a platform to match these two)
	Nat Govt. (legislative), Ministry of Justice	<b>Legal Framework:</b> Create enabling environment indicate how data privacy/safety/security as well as sharing are guaranteed, property rights.
	Nat Govt. (legislative)	Joint development of <b>Digital Strategy</b> (data architecture: System how data is organized and used for policy making) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ allow expert panel to validate data before sharing</li> <li>➤ All data should be shared unless embargoed (needs protection)</li> </ul> Capacity building/training on the job/coaching (strengthening institutions with brain and tools)
	Ministry of Infrastructure / Communications  + private actors (mobile companies)	Investment in <b>mobile networks and power access.</b> Ensure connectivity to digital data services.  (Foresee demand)

2.2 How can different kinds of organisation (e.g., those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

- Shared learning – countries are invariably at different levels and will benefit from learning from each other.



2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

- There is a need to balance getting all relevant stakeholders in place and timeliness of system.
- Develop national digital strategy, policy and legal framework.
- Establish independent certification bodies.
- Invest in appropriate infrastructure to support digital solution. Private sector willing to contribute if it makes business sense. Need for an enabling environment.

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

- Timeliness and participation trade-offs – go forward and utilize data
- Who has the mandate for leading? Is it the Ministry of Agriculture? National Government with support from UN agencies will give network mandate.
- How to include smallholders? – use of appropriate technology and extension.

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

## Notes Discussion Group: Conducive Research Partnerships

**Conducive Research Partnerships - Vision:** International agricultural research partnerships focus on the elements of agroecology and climate resilience and take into account different regional contexts, especially also low income and/or fragile countries, and make their findings available to all.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue (**a few weeks later**), the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions. The group work in this round will follow a plenary presentation to update participants on the results of Round 1. You will also be provided in advance with summary results based on the notes you shared with us from Round 1.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

### **Actions:**

Document the existing learning cases and encourage learning and reflections by all the stakeholders

International research partnership and donors should encourage bottom-up approach and build on existing experiences and systems

Produce evidence based policy to influence governments and donors

Think complementarity and synergy (both international and country based actors)

Share the benefits and credits with other stakeholders (all the stakeholders)

Encourage the culture of transparency

### **Better results:**

More inclusive

More systemic

Building bridges

Ownership by actors who innovate.

2.2 How can different kinds of organization (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

Encourage exchanges, efficient and user friendly multi-directional communication

Encourage learning and reflections

Share widely results through print, social media policy briefs and various public interactions engaging all the stakeholders

Encourage interactions and cross learning amount the various groups

2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

Encourage inclusivity

Develop and deploy demand led research

Support research which encourages co-creation of research products

Balance between demand led research and agro-ecologies and integrate users' systems

International Research partnerships should provide various options/products for national and local partners to choose from and adapt

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

**Key areas of debate**

- (1) How to ensure all the actors are genuinely and fully included? How? Ensure engagement, it should be donor and government requirements, listen to actors
- (2) How to we enhance accountability and transparency? How? Empower actors to demand accountability through participatory research, ensure participatory monitoring and evaluation
- (3) How to ensure that actors genuine feedback across actors? How: institutionalize regular reflections and learning sessions
- (4) How to ensure multi-directional learning and reflections across? – the same as above
- (5) How do we ensure that systemic changes are taking place rather radical and abrupt changes? - External ideas/concepts should integrate /embed in the existing systems not impose to them

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

How to balance the interests of small holders farmers vs the multi-nationals

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

Apparently small farmers and farmers' groups are not full engaged in the FSD and UNFSS processes!

## Notes Discussion Group: Agroecological Farming

**Agroecological Farming - Vision:** An agroecological diversification of production and low-impact farming practices reducing the use of fossil fuels and chemical inputs lead to more sustainable management of natural resources, safer food consumption and the creation of more employment opportunities.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

Since agroecology is very **knowledge intensive** and has a strong tie to the environmental, soil, etc. **context**, in order to achieve the vision the group proposed to focus on developing:

- **Peer to peer program** focused on application of agroecological concepts for farmers (potentially also for other actors in the food system). This would require in-person exchange and inclusion of the farmer communities (both small holder farmers, as well as large scale exemplary farmers). This peer to peer exchange would need to be seen as coming from a research center.
- Delivery of training and knowledge management resources via a **digital platform** that would enable this peer to peer exchange, as well as collect and operationalize agricultural data. Having a peer-to-peer element at its core the platform would enable the actors to not only share, but also co-produce knowledge related to agroecology. Building networks around agroecology and developing a collection of good/ best practices could then also influence relevant policy change towards agroecological principles.
- It is important that there is a dedicated space on the platform for women/ women's groups/ female farmers

We would need to look at the existing actors on the ground, and the delivery of the platform would require:

- Donors willing to fund the development, rollout and maintenance of the platform. SDC could be a potential good starting point in terms of donor involvement, since they are interested in promoting the achievement of the visions statement and could leverage and extensive network of partners to team up with. In approaching donors (including SDC) it is critical to show existing evidence in support of the project and clearly define the results the peer to peer network and digital platform could bring. In this case these could be research-based recommendations on agro-ecological practices and how they can be scaled through the network.
- It is important to also have local governments supporting the adoption and use of the platform. It is important to have government buy-in in addition to their potential role in cost-sharing with external donors
- NGOs and social movements should support and promote the adoption and usage – good extension services can help reach people on the ground
- High level lobby/ high input agriculture – it is important to acknowledge the existing role played by industrial chemical companies and other lobby interests when designing the peer to peer network and the digital platform.
- Research and academia need to be part of the network to contribute curated existing knowledge/ good practices and applied research

- Private sector – the role of the private sector could include ensuring access to the platforms (in terms of both access to the internet and access to devices). Possibly there could be the options of teaming up with big tech companies

How the results would be measured:

- By evaluating the number of stories/ questions/ recommendations and other content being contributed to the online platform by farmers and other actors on the ground.
- Participation rate – assessing whether the participation rate on the platform is growing

It is important that the platform build on traditional networks:

- Should have an offline face to face peer exchanges and opportunities
- Should involve technology/ platform champions
- Needs to build on natural established social networks in the communities. Women are very strong in traditional network; the platform would need to enable their access to the formal system and build on this strength.

## 2.2 How can different kinds of organization (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

- CDE, University of Bern and BFH-HAFL can act as transdisciplinary centers with local offices (in the case of CDE), and help identify best practices, and connect people across geographies. They can be the “conveners of the conversation”. There is a lot of knowledge on agroecology, and these actors could identify where the gaps in the knowledge are, such as application of agroecology in specific climates/conditions. They could then seek to address these blind spots with new research.
- SDC S.Sudan – as a potential donor. Unfortunately, the context in S.Sudan is largely humanitarian at the moment, and only now the focus is growing on resilience building and the work with farmers.
- icipe – could contribute to the body of knowledge on push-pull technology, as well as vector an pest management
- SWISSAID Tanzania – could potentially help with the capacity development activities on the ground. Currently the teams are working with masters and PhD students on pest management and soil. The team in Tanzania currently has developed a smart phone app for farmers to share information (like Facebook). The team could also act in the role of experts to validate recommendations/ respond to questions coming through the platform

## 2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

- It is important to have massive investment in training and education in order to increase agroecological farming
- Agroecological farming should consider practices related to pest and disease management as well as access to seeds – practices need to be improved and more information needs to be made available
- It is important to bring together key stakeholder from related areas, not only agriculture, but also such sectors as health and nutrition to help amplify the message
- Conflict sensitivity – it is important to be mindful and aware of conflict sensitivity when introducing agroecological farming.

2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

n/a

2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

It is important to better understand the practicality of scaling a digital solution – most countries have 3G and android devices, but there is also the question of digital literacy/ digital capacity.

The group focused most of the discussion on the production part of the food system – the group did not have a chance to discuss marketing/ distribution of agroecological products. When considering the entire value chain it is critical to involve the private sector, and include diverse buyers and processors.

Diversification – should we consider the area of crop diversification as an area of focus within the statement? It is not an issue for smallholder sustenance farmers, for them it would be a question of how through agroecological farming they could increase yields, but this could be an area of concern for large-scale actors – how they can produce more diverse crops without extensive extra effort. There are still many areas in the world that require a strong focus on food security and nutrition, which could strongly benefit from crop diversification (example: S. Sudan currently predominantly plants sorghum – in part this lack of choice has to do with climate/context)

2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

none

## Notes Discussion Group: Intact Natural Resources

**Intact Natural Resources - Vision:** Intact natural resources: By switching to locally adapted crops, soil conservation methods and sustainable irrigation systems, which use as little water as possible, (cost-) efficient food production can be maintained, while preserving water resources & aquaculture, improving soil quality, reducing soil-erosion and better adapting to adverse effects of climate change.

**Round 2 Objective:** In Round 2 of the Food Systems Dialogue, the goal is to provide recommendations about what needs to be done, and by whom between now and 2030, to move closer to the vision, as well as to identify areas of significant divergence or disagreement, and any open questions.

2.1 What action needs to be taken (and by which stakeholders) to achieve the vision? What would be different or better as a result? In other words, what would success look like?

Recommendation to revise the vision statement into:

**Keeping natural resources intact:** switching to sustainable food production systems that conserve land, water and biodiversity (incl germplasm diversity) and more nature-positive approaches to producing food (e.g. protein through insect rearing) that are better adapted to adverse effects of climate change.

Key discussion points and suggestions about the vision statement:

- Vision statement should be concise, clear and achievable within a set time frame– intact nature is a very broad term. It needs to have a much more integrated and overarching approach. It should broaden the scope by including other sources of foods, by going beyond locally adapted crops, and include other sources of food/proteins, such as animals and insects. There is a growing trend of including insects in diet, particularly among urban consumers, and therefore entomologists and insect specialists are looking into such aspects. The aspect of fishery is left out when we focus only on terrestrial food production system. Can countries be bold enough to set time-bound indicators, e.g. commit to xx% less water used in food production by 2030?
- Therefore, the focus of the intact natural system should not only focus on the landscapes, but also on seascape and waterscapes, in order to promote a comprehensive conservation friendly approach across all food generating systems, and at the same time also considering the consumer choices, relevant policies and institutions.
- This means the core objective of intact natural resources should take a system approach – revolving around integrated landscape approach. Another important aspect of such approach should focus on preserving/promoting (agro) biodiversity, broadening food base, but at the same time, making it less extractive and nature friendly or nature positive. So, the approach should focus on diversifying food base, and therefore, the agroecosystem, and at the same time maintaining a healthy balance with nature and biodiversity.
- A biodiverse positive system or nature friendly agriculture and aquaculture system should also ensure that no new forests or wetlands are destroyed, no habitats are converted into agriculture cultivation, and food production is less extractive.

2.2 How can different kinds of organisation (e.g. those represented in your group) contribute to the vision?

- Integrated landscape/seascape approach, as suggested above, inevitably need to bring together different kinds of stakeholders and the organizations. Stakeholders such as farmers of different sizes - small holders, medium and large scale farmers; private sector, financial institutions, CSOs, consumers and policy makers across all kinds of food generating systems, and international organizations and coalitions to link with SDG targets on food security.

CSO/NGOs have important role to play in awareness raising and transforming the consumer behavior as well as all the actors in food supply chain to minimize the food loss and food wastage.

- In order to make the landscape approach practical and applicable on the ground, the stakeholders will need to be clearly identified at different levels – local, regional and global with their roles being identified clearly and linkages between and among them. This will require adequate research support to indentify key landscapes/seascapes of global significance for promoting sustainable food production practices alongside conserving biodiversity.

### 2.3 What **specific recommendations** does the group have for the Food Systems Summit regarding the vision?

- Focus on top 10 global priority landscape/seascape/river basins and protected areas to optimize food production and ensure food security, while also conserving biodiversity and minimizing climate impacts of current food production system
- By 2025, 30% of area under agriculture and aquaculture is sustainably managed with no new forest lands conversion;
- By 2025, halve the global food waste and reduce post-harvest loss
- By 2025, human and planetary health are aligned to halve the global footprint of diets
- Conduct largescale campaigns to raise awareness about food production system and its process, to make a shift to healthier food, broaden food base, importance of biodiverse agriculture system, relationship between nature and food production, behavioural change to reduce food waistage etc. (key questions are what kind of awareness is needed, who will be the target audience, what methods and tools can be used, how will this finances, how do we measure the success etc.)
- Generate a baseline of countries across different food production zones/regions to understand food production system, environment cost of food production and nature positive and nature negative practices of food production
- Create a baseline and ranking of countries according to food loss and food wastage (perhaps such ranking is already existing)
- Technological innovation to improve the farming practices, such as irrigation system
- Understand each country/region in terms of diet from consumer point of view and develop farming system accordingly and providing enabling policy support
- Develop mechanism and approaches to report the food wastage and make food service business/distributor accountable to minimize the food waste
- For making food production system as nature positive, there must be scale at which it can be measured as nature positive or nature negative – a filtering lense through which a food system can be ranked as nature positive or nature negative
- Developing incentive mechanisms for the stakeholders across the supply chain including consumers to behave and act sustainably and responsibly, but not at the cost of making disadvantage groups futher disadvantaged

### 2.4 What are the key areas of debate in relation to the vision, and how can they be managed?

Key areas of debate include:



- Broadening the scope of the vision and take a system approach, rather than keeping a narrow focus on locally adapted crops, it should focus on locally adapted food production system
- At some places, the vision statement gets into too many details, such as reducing soil erosion, or irrigation system etc. Vision statement should focus on higher level goal and objective, while the details can be worked out at outcome, outputs and activity level, while executing the vision statement

#### 2.5 What open questions still need to be answered, if any?

- How do we measure progress and success in achieving this vision statement?
- How will we measure the environmental cost of food production across different regions and food production zones?
- What it means for local stakeholders to conserve food system along with biodiversity conservation?
- How are we going to ensure that multiple stakeholders buy into the notion of nature friendly production system?
- How to finance the proposed transformative approach in the food production system?
- How do we preserve the seeds of locally diverse variety of crops and other edible species, particularly keeping in mind that big seed producing companies are distributing seeds of few limited variety, and this is threatening the existence of locally producing seeds and germ plasm

#### 2.6 Do you have any additional observations from your discussions?

Would it be possible to make an analogy with the “polluter pays” principle and with the energy labels (from red to green) and come up with consistently agreed labels for nature negative and nature positive production system?